



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,245	06/27/2001	Soung-joon Park	P07276US00/MP	1552
881	7590	05/24/2006	EXAMINER	
STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MILEF, ELDA G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/891,245	PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elda Milef	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ✓ 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the consumer service provider" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 8-10 are rejected because of their dependency to the rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior

Art Unit: 3628

art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd (US PG. Pub. No. 2005/0055252).

Re claim 1: Todd discloses:

a system comprising storing therein consumer information including schedule information inputted from a consumer who desires to receive a specified service ("the InternetCustomer database 200 identifies each client who has registered and is participating within the system of the present invention. The specific type of data actually stored in the InternetCustomer database 200, such as relevant contact information about the client, is shown in more detail in FIG. 7 and in Table 2...Similar information about any single appointment is stored in the Appointment database 400..."-see [0029]. Although Todd does not specifically disclose that the InternetCustomer database include schedule information, Figs. 6 shows that the Appointment database 400 is connected to the InternetCustomer database and therefore, it is obvious that scheduling information would be input by the consumer;

a control part for requesting the consumer to register the consumer information through a network, providing the schedule information stored the consumer database to a

Art Unit: 3628

service provider who provides the service, and providing to the consumer details of the service that corresponds to the schedule information provided from the service provider ("The InternetCustomer database 200 identifies each client who has registered...")-see [0029] and ("the client initiates the method of navigating to a search criteria input screen display, s...inputting search criteria...The system server processes the search request by accessing the BusinessCustomer database and determining which service providers satisfy the criteria...the client is presented 1020 with a list of service providers that satisfy the search criteria...")-see [0034], (" Business Detail View Screen")-see [0030], see Figs. 1-3

Re claim 6: Further a method would have been necessary to perform the system of previously rejected claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd in view of Improvenet (Why Use "ImproveNet-Certified" Pros? Retrieved from <<http://web.archive.org/web/19991128124418/www.improvenet.com/ourhouse/contractorscreens/howwescreen.html>>. Nov. 04, 1999. Retrieved May 17, 2006.)

Re claim 2: Todd discloses a system comprising a service provider database for storing therein service provider information-see ("the BusinessCustomer database 100...") and Table 2, Fig. 5, wherein in case that the service provider decides to provide the service, the control part provides to the consumer the service provider information along with the service particulars ("From this screen, the client then selects a particular service provider from the list of those available. The client is then presented 1030 with an appointment/reservation query form for the selected service provider.")-see [0034], also see ("Business Detail View screen")-[0030].

Art Unit: 3628

Although Todd discloses a service provider database for storing therein service provider information as indicated above, Todd does not specifically disclose that the information include credit valuation information valued according to assets and business results of the service provider. ImproveNet however, shows a database of pre-screened service providers. The client can check the background of the service provider including credit history, legal history and recommendations, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Todd to include that the service provider database store information relating to the credit, and legal histories as well as recommendations of a service provider in order to provide the client with the most reliable service providers.

Re claim 3: Todd discloses:

wherein the consumer database stores therein consumer's credit valuation information valued according to the consumer's credit transaction information from financial agencies, and particulars of the consumer's schedule reservation and cancellation, and the control part provides the credit valuation information along with the schedule information to the service provider-see [0007] and [0011].

Art Unit: 3628

Re claim 7: For purposes of examination, the Examiner is interpreting "the consumer service provider" to mean the service provider. Further a method would have been necessary to perform the system of previously rejected claim 2 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Re claim 8: Further a method would have been necessary to perform the system of previously rejected claim 3 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Todd in view of Improvenet as applied to claims 3 and 8 above, further in view of Loveland (US Patent No. 6,810,383).

Re claim 4: Neither Todd not Improvenet specifically disclose further comprising a communication part for providing the consumer information to the service provider through mobile communications.

Loveland however, teaches an automated task management and evaluation system and (" a service provider may wish to receive typical assignments by e-mail, but receive emergency assignments by pager, cell phone or some other method or combination of methods.")-see col. 7 lines 5-7. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 3628

was made to modify Todd and Improvenet to include using a wireless device such as a cell phone to notify the service provider of assignments in order to improve the communication efficiency and ensure prompt contact.

Re claim 5: Todd discloses wherein the control part classifies the consumers according to the kind of service, and provides the consumer information on the respective classified consumers to the service provider of the corresponding service.- ("in a computerized system...each service provider having associated therewith a plurality of identifying criteria, receiving from the client a search request having a plurality of desired criteria associated ...comparing the plurality of desired criteria...presenting the client with a list of service providers having associated therewith the desired criteria.")-see [0008].

Re claim 9: Further a method would have been necessary to perform the system of previously rejected claim 4 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Re claim 10: Further a method would have been necessary to perform the system of previously rejected claim 5 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale. In addition, Todd discloses providing a service purchase condition

Art Unit: 3628

from the service provider to the respective consumers.-see
[0030].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Belton, Beth. *Homeowners Find Contractors on the Internet*. USA Today. McLean, Va: Apr. 13, 1999. pg. 02.B.-Cited for its reference to the ImproveNet site which has a national database of contractors, architects, and designers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elda Milef whose telephone number is (571)272-8124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:30 am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571)272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600